

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

SHENEA JAMES

Plaintiff,

ORDER

23-CV-6057-DGL-MJP

v.

CITY OF ROCHESTER ET AL

Defendants.

---

Pursuant to the order of the Hon. David G. Larimer, United States District Judge, referring the above case to the undersigned for pretrial procedures and the entry of a scheduling order as provided in Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 16(b) and Local Rule 16, the parties are hereby directed to fully comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26.

All parties are reminded that effective December 1, 2015, Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure was amended. These amendments address the scope and conduct of discovery. **All parties are expected to be familiar with and fully comply with the requirements of amended Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.**

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that each party, including any party appearing without counsel, shall appear before the undersigned on **April 26, 2023, at 11:00 a.m.**, 1360 United States Courthouse, 100 State Street, Rochester, New York for the purpose of entry of a scheduling order as required by Rule 16(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; and it is further

**ORDERED** that pursuant to Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall confer at least 21 days prior to the Rule 16(b) conference as scheduled above for

the purpose of preparing the “Proposed Discovery Plan” (PDP) required by Rule 26(f)(3). The PDP shall be in writing and shall specifically address relevant issues concerning the management of all pretrial discovery practice in this case, **including**:

1. In his referral order, Judge Larimer has specifically encouraged the parties to consider the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(c) governing consent to complete disposition of the case (including trial, if necessary) by this Court. **The parties shall state in the PDP whether or not unanimous consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction has been agreed upon.**
2. Deadline for compliance with the mandatory disclosure requirements found in Rule 26(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Any objections to the required disclosures must also be stated in the PDP.
3. Deadline for the filing of motions to amend the pleadings or add parties.
4. Deadline for completion of fact discovery.
5. If expert discovery is contemplated by any party, a deadline for the completion of all expert discovery, including full compliance with Rule 26(a)(2) regarding the identification and filing reports of testifying experts.
6. Deadline for the filing of motions to compel discovery.
7. Any Orders that should be entered under Rule 26(c) (protective/confidentiality orders).
8. Any changes in the limitations on discovery as provided in Rule 30 (oral depositions), and Rule 33 (interrogatories practice) and Rule 34 (document requests).
9. Any issues that the parties reasonably foresee concerning discovery of electronically stored information, including the form or forms in which it should be produced.
10. Any agreements between the parties concerning assertions of claims of attorney-client privilege or work-product protection after

information is produced, including agreements reached under Federal Rule of Evidence 502.

11. Deadline for the filing of dispositive motions.
12. The advisability and timing of a judicially supervised settlement conference or other alternative dispute resolution, including mediation.
13. The parties shall advise whether a jury trial is required and the estimated length of the trial.

After meeting, the parties shall prepare a written PDP as required by Rule 26(f) and electronically file the PDP report with the Clerk's Office no later than 4 business days prior to the Rule 16(b) conference as herein scheduled. At the conclusion of the Rule 16(b) conference and after conferring with the parties, this Court will issue a scheduling order governing all further pretrial proceedings in this action. Out-of-town attorneys may submit a letter requesting to participate in the Rule 16 conference by telephone.

The parties are reminded of their duty to preserve evidence, which “arises when the party has notice that the evidence is relevant to litigation or when a party should have known that the evidence may be relevant to future litigation.” *Fujitsu Ltd. v. Fed. Exp. Corp.*, 247 F.3d 423, 436 (2d Cir. 2001).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Mark W. Pedersen  
MARK W. PEDERSEN  
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: Rochester, New York  
March 10, 2023

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Western District of New York

SHENEA JAMES,

Plaintiff

v.

CITY OF ROCHESTER ET AL,

Defendants

NOTICE, CONSENT, AND ORDER OF REFERENCE -  
EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION BY A UNITED STATES  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE

23-CV-6057-DGL-MJP

**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION**

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(c), and Fed.R.Civ.P. 73, you are notified that a United States magistrate judge of this district court is available to conduct any or all proceedings in this case including a jury or nonjury trial, and to order the entry of a final judgment. Exercise of this jurisdiction by a magistrate judge is, however, permitted only if all parties voluntarily consent.

You may, without adverse substantive consequences, withhold your consent, but this will prevent the court's jurisdiction from being exercised by a magistrate judge. If any party withdraws consent, the identity of the parties consenting or withholding consent will not be communicated to any magistrate judge or to the district judge to whom the case has been assigned.

An appeal from a judgment entered by a magistrate judge shall be taken directly to the United States court of appeals for this judicial circuit in the same manner as an appeal from any other judgment of a district court.

**CONSENT TO THE EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION BY A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(c) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 73, the parties in this case consent to have a United States magistrate judge conduct any and all proceedings in the case, including the trial, order the entry of a final judgment, and conduct all post-judgment proceedings.

Party Represented

Signatures

Date

---

---

---

---

**ORDER OF REFERENCE**

IT IS ORDERED that this case be referred to Mark W. Pedersen, United States Magistrate Judge, to conduct all proceedings and order the entry of Judgment in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636(c) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 73.

---

Date

---

United States District Judge

NOTE: RETURN THIS FORM TO THE CLERK OF THE COURT ONLY IF ALL PARTIES HAVE CONSENTED ON  
THIS FORM TO THE EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION BY A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE.